

Remarks

Claims 1-21 were pending. Claims 1-5, 18, 20, and 21 have been cancelled. Claim 14 has been amended to correct a minor issue with antecedent basis while claim 19 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of the base claims. Furthermore, claims 6, 10, 14, and 19 have been amended to address the Advisory Action's indication that the claims did not refer to the message identifier of the "forwarded message" matching an entry in a blacklist database. Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance after final as set forth more fully below. Applicants request that a Notice of Allowance be provided or at the least that the finality of the current action be withdrawn.

112 Rejections

Claim 14 has been rejected for lack of antecedent basis of "it". The claim has been amended to replace "it" with "the electronic message" which does have antecedent basis. Accordingly, the rejection may be withdrawn after final.

102 Rejections

Claims 1 and 3-21 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Dognata (US Pat 6,728,714). Claims 1-5 have been cancelled such that the rejection to claims 1 and 3-5 is moot. Furthermore, claim 19 now includes the recitations of claim 18, and claims 18, 20 and 21 have been cancelled such that the rejection of claims 18, 20, and 21 is moot. Claims 6, 10, 14, and 19 now recite "the message identifier of the message being forwarded." The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections to the extent they apply to pending claims 6-17 and 19.

The Office Action rejects independent claims 6, 10, and 14 by stating that Dognata teaches all of the elements. In particular, the Office Action relies on the email message database of Dognata as being the blacklist database of message IDs as recited in the claims. However, it must be noted that in claims 6, 10, and 14, the message ID is stored in the blacklist database in response to scanning messages for a request not to forward and storing the message ID whenever the request is found for those messages being scanned. In contrast, the message database of Dognata stores all messages, and

hence all message IDs, at all times while the messages continue to exist such that Dognata fails to disclose that the message IDs are stored in a database in response to scanning for a request not to forward and finding that the request exists for a particular message. Thus, it is evident that Dognata does not disclose the combination of the scanning and storing recitations of these claims since Dognata does not store the message ID for a message in a blacklist database in response to scanning the message and finding that it contains a request not to forward.

Because Dognata fails to disclose such recitations, Dognata does not disclose all of the elements of the claims 6, 10, and 14. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 6, 10, and 14 are allowable over Dognata. Dependent claims 7-9, 11-13, and 15-17 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 19 also includes recitations not disclosed by Dognata. In rejecting claim 19, the Office Action states that Dognata discloses all of the elements including receiving user input included in the header being created where the user input is referenced upon an attempt to forward the electronic message. However, Dognata fails to disclose that there is user input within the electronic message not to be forwarded that is referenced to prevent forwarding of that same electronic message. To the contrary, Dognata discloses that a separate cancellation message that is distinct from the message to be cancelled is sent in order to cancel the message. Thus, there is no user input within the message to be cancelled that is referenced to cause cancellation but instead, there is user input via a separate cancellation message. Thus, it is evident that Dognata does not disclose referencing user input of the electronic message be prevented from being forwarded in order to prevent such forwarding.

Because Dognata fails to disclose such recitations, Dognata does not disclose all of the elements of claim 19. Therefore, claim 19 is allowable over Dognata for at least these reasons.

103 Rejections


Claims 1 and 3-5 have been rejected under 35 USC 103. However, as noted above, these claims have been cancelled such that these rejections are now moot.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 6-17 and 19 is in condition for allowance after final. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the amendment and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due beyond the fee for continued examination and an extension of time. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,


Date: February 13, 2006
Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093